Serial No. 10/075,283   NIT-163-02

REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 10-18 are pending.

Claims 10 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Turtle, US 5,265,065 (Turtle). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

The invention claimed in claim 10 is a service for searching documents. According to the service, at least one document retrieved by a first search (e.g., keyword search) of a first database is input to the first database from which it came, to make a weighted term list reflecting the importance of the terms in the first document database. Then, the weighted term list is used as an input to perform a second search of a second document database. In addition to reflecting the importance of each term in the first document database, each term is weighted considering the importance thereof in both the first and second document databases, the weight being used to calculate the relevance of each document of the second document database.

The Office Action finds the input of the first document to the first database in Turtle at column 21, lines 54-61. This passage, however (actually part of claim 13 of the patent), discloses a database of phrases consisting of stemmed

7

Serial No. 10/075,283   NIT-163-02

terms derived from natural-language phrases, and a document
database containing representations of the contents of the
texts of a plurality of documents. There is no disclosure of
inputting a document to the database, wherein the input
document itself resulted from a search of the database.

Against the step of making a weighted term list, the
Office Action cites Turtle at column 22, lines 16-36 (parts of
claims 13 and 14), which disclose comparing search terms to
the document database to identify the frequency of the search
terms in the documents therein; assigning a statistical weight
to the individual documents representing their probability of
matching the search query; ranking the documents based on the
statistical weight; identifying stemmed terms in the query
that are shared by successive identified groups of stemmed
terms; and identifying whether the number of stemmed terms in
the successive groups is equal or unequal. However, there is
no input of a document according to Turtle, and thus no
weighted term list derived from an input document that
reflects the importance of the terms in the document.

The Office Action also asserts Turtle's abstract as
disclosing the claimed search of a second document database
using the weighted term list as a search input. Turtle's
abstract, however, notes a single search of a document network

8

Serial No. 10/075,283   NIT-163-02

using, as a search input, search query elements derived by
matching individual words of a natural-language input query to
a database to first remove stopwords, then to stem the
remaining words after stopword removal, and finally to
identify phrases in the resulting stemmed words to form the
search query from the identified phrases and unidentified
stemmed words. There is no second search of a second database
using a weighted term list, and there is no weighted term list
derived from a search using a document as an input, in Turtle.

Finally, the Office Action finds the claimed meaning of
the weighted term list in Turtle at column 25, lines 16-34
(claim 26). Claim 26, however, discloses that the terms
forming an input query may include one or more groups of terms
forming citations having numerical terms; wherein each group
of terms forming a citation is identified and replaced by a
citation word comprising the numerical terms of the group and
a predetermined word-level proximity number; the citation
words are compared to representations of document contents to
identify the frequency of occurrences of the citation words in
the representations; and a statistical weight is assigned to
each document concerning the probability that the document
matches the search query. None of this suggests the weighting
of list terms to reflect the importance of the terms in two

9

Serial No. 10/075,283   NIT-163-02

document databases, or the use of the weights to calculate the
relevance of each document in a second database searched with
the weighted term list as a search input.

Concerning claim 18, Turtle fails to disclose the claimed
search of two document databases, in which a client transmits
a set of documents in a first search input, receives a summary
comprising only topic words related to the set of documents,
sends a second search input corresponding to said summary
reflecting a user's evaluation of the summary to search a
second document database, and receives a search result from
the search of the second document database; wherein said
server storing the first document database produces the
summary of topic words and transmits the summary to the
client, and searches and transmits a set of documents having a
high relevance to any desired summary sent by the client, to
the client. Turtle's abstract and claims 13-14 (cited in the
rejection) have been discussed above, and are clearly
distinguishable. Further, Turtle's column 11, lines 24-42
disclose essentially the same subject matter as the abstract,
and similarly fails to disclose the searching of two document
databases as claimed in claim 18.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants request
reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

10

Serial No. 10/075,283   NIT-163-02

    The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any

additional fees which may be required, or to credit any

overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1417.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32,846
Attorney for Applicants

</div>

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: (703) 684-1120
Facsimile: (703) 684-1157
Date: April 11, 2006

11